

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-22, 26, 28, and 33 were pending. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-22, 26, 28, and 33 were finally rejected over new grounds of rejection. The independent claim 1 is amended
5 herein. No claim is newly added. No new matter is introduced. Support for the amendments proposed herein can be found in the specification as originally filed, particularly on page 11, line 25, through page 14, line 14, and Figures 4, 6, and 7.

The Examiner finally rejected all pending claims as being unpatentable over previously cited
10 Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,067,525, hereinafter Johnson) in view of Cannon (U.S. Pat. No. 6,286,005) under 35 USC § 103(a).

It is respectfully submitted that Cannon is not a viable reference inasmuch as that it has been overcome by the Declaration submitted on January 10, 2003. The Declaration was entered
15 per the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on February 25, 2003. See, also, Reply C filed on July 29, 2003, in response to the Office Action mailed on April 29, 2003 (Paper No. 14). All of the reasons why the claimed invention is patentable over Johnson and Cannon, as well as other cited references, individually and/or in combination, have been thoroughly discussed with detailed examples in the previous Replies, which are all hereby
20 incorporated by reference. These previously raised arguments **are still relevant to Johnson** (MPEP 707.07).

The present application as claimed in **claims 1, 3, 5-7, 10-22, 26, 28, and 33** recites subject matter not reached by the closest prior art of record, Johnson. As such, it is respectfully

submitted that the claimed invention is **patently distinct from and *prima facie* unobvious over Johnson and therefore should be allowed.**

To expedite the prosecution and place the present application in a condition for allowance,
5 Applicants have further amended the independent claim 1 to **make certain implicit claim language more explicit** without raising new issues or changing the direction of the claims.

More specifically, in the amended claim 1

- the claim term “sources” are amended as “web page sources” defined in a sources
10 configuration file [Spec. page 12, lines 8-9, and 30], thereby distinguishing Johnson’s “remote sites” [Johnson col. 11, lines 3-9];
- the claim term “an automated spider” is amended to make its location explicit, i.e., on a server computer [Spec. page 11, lines 25-28], thereby distinguishing Johnson’s “lead generation component” that includes a number of modules that *may* be installed
15 at various sites for the purpose of providing “site specific” sale information [Johnson col. 11, lines 3-9];
- the claim term “an automated spider” is amended to make its capabilities explicit [Spec. page 11, line 25, through page 12, line 4], thereby distinguishing Johnson’s “modules” (Web site module 304) that facilitate the connection to the Internet Web
20 sites [Johnson col. 10, line 55, through col. 11, line 9; Figure 3]; and
- the step of obtaining purchase indicators from the web page sources (step c)) is further clarified per Figures 4, 6, and 7, thereby categorically distinguishing how Johnson’s “lead information” is obtained [Johnson, Figures 1-3].

Having disqualified Cannon, the finality of the Office Action no longer applies. Thus, entry of this Amendment is submitted to be proper. The amendments presented herein encompass a bona fide attempt to place the present application in a condition for allowance. The Examiner
5 is sincerely invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues or to suggest any appropriate actions necessary to accelerate the prosecution and forward the present application to allowance. The undersigned can be reached directly at 650-331-8413, 10AM-7PM PST, Monday-Friday.

Respectfully submitted,



Katharina Wang Schuster, Reg. No. 50,000
Attorney for the Applicants

LUMEN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SERVICES
2345 Yale Street, Second Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(O) 650-424-0100 x 8413 (F) 650-424-0141